

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on September 26, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claim 30 is amended, and no claims are canceled or added; as a result, claims 1, 6-11, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 28, and 30-44 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claim 30 was rejected under 37 CFR ' 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form since it depends on canceled claim 29. Applicant has amended claim 30 to be dependent on claim 28.

'103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 6-8, 11, 14, 19-20, 22, 32-33, 38 and 40-41 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,917) in view of James et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,472) and further in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,426). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the reasons discussed below.

1) *Ishizaki is not reasonably pertinent and is nonanalogous art*

Applicants' disclosure pertains to address translation and buffering of address translation in virtual memory systems. Applicants' disclosure further pertains to translation look-aside buffers (TLBs), and locking entries in TLBs. In contrast, Ishizaki pertains to a "method for communication between processors in a parallel computer" (see the Abstract of Ishizaki). Ishizaki does not discuss address translation, virtual memory, or translation look-aside buffers. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Ishizaki is not reasonably pertinent, and is not analogous art.

2) *No motivation to combine has been presented*

The Office Action states “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the current invention was made to implement the compare step taught by Ishizaki in the method taught by the combination of Okada and James.” Applicants respectfully submit that this amounts to a conclusory statement. The Office Action has not shown that any reason, suggestion, or motivation exists in the prior art for a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention to make the combination.

3) *The combination does not render the claimed invention obvious*

The Office Action alleges that Ishizaki “teaches that the value of the page usage metric (i.e. the parameters based on the execution of the object code) is compared with (sum of) values of page usage metrics for a plurality of other processes (i.e. the parameters for the communication pattern which are stored in the working area) to determine if they are identical.” See page 4 of the Office Action.

Applicants respectfully disagree. In making the above assertion, the Examiner has equated the “page usage metric” of the instant application with “parameters based on execution of the object code” of Ishizaki; and has also equated “values of page usage metrics for a plurality of other processes” of the instant application with “parameters for the communication pattern which are stored in the working area” of Ishizaki. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no basis for equating the cited elements of the instant application and Ishizaki. The cited portions of Ishizaki describe communications between processors in a parallel processing system, and have nothing to do with page usage metrics. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Ishizaki does not teach as alleged in the Office Action.

Claims 9-10 and 34-35 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,917) in view of James et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,472) and further in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,426). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the same reasons as provided above with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 11, 14, 19-20, 22, 32-33, 38 and 40-41.

Claims 15, 23, 31, 36-37, 39 and 42 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,917) in view of James et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,472) further in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,426) and further in view of Gaither (U. S. Patent No. 6,223,256). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the same reasons as provided above with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 11, 14, 19-20, 22, 32-33, 38 and 40-41.

Claims 28, 30 and 43-44 were rejected under 35 USC ' 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greene (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0139473) in view of Okada (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,917) further in view of James et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,472) and further in view of Ishizaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,761,426). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the basis that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been presented for the same reasons as provided above with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 11, 14, 19-20, 22, 32-33, 38 and 40-41.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 10/602,509

Filing Date: June 24, 2003

Title: DYNAMIC TLB LOCKING

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 11

Dkt: 80107.023US1 (INTEL)

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

MOINUL H. KHAN ET AL.

By their Representatives,

Customer Number 45445

Telephone Number 952-473-8800

Date 11-28-05

By Dana B. LeMoine
Dana B. LeMoine
Reg. No. 40,062

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O.Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 28 day of November, 2005.

Chris Hammond
Name

Chris Hammond
Signature